



**MARYLAND GREEN BUILDING COUNCIL  
MEETING SUMMARY  
LOWE HOUSE OFFICE BUILDING ROOM 150  
25 SEPTEMBER 2013**

**Attendees:**

Secretary Alvin Collins – DGS  
Tom Liebel – MDGBC  
Stephen Gilliss – DGS  
David Costello - MDE  
Mark Beck - USM  
Lauren Buckler – DGS  
Scott Walchak – DGS OAG

David St. Jean - MEA  
Soren Graae - DBM  
Meg Andrews - MDOT  
Caroline Varney- Alvarado - DHCD  
Anja Caldwell – MDGBC  
Ellen Robertson - DGS  
Crystal Heide - DLS

I. Chairman Tom Liebel brought the meeting to order. Introductions of all attendees followed. Tom announced that Denise Watkins is resigning due to her work load and any recommendations for people to fill the vacancy would be welcome. Secretary Collins was present and took the opportunity to thank the members for their work on the IgCC and looks forward to the Council's continuing guidance on this and other issues moving forward.

II. Chairman Liebel postponed the approval of last month's meeting summary as a quorum was not present at the beginning of the meeting. At the end of the meeting others had arrived making a quorum. The Chair asked for and received a motion to approve the previous meeting's written summary. Motion was made and the meeting summary was approved.

III. Chairman Liebel also asked members to think about future topics for the Council to get involved in as we wrap up the IgCC study and recommendations.

A. Secretary Collins noted that the topic of sustainability is highly important to the Administration. Within DGS he has asked Lauren Buckler, Anne Jackson, Steve Gilliss and others to look at sustainability on a more holistic basis and to look at the larger picture which brings together green building, energy, green procurement, green leasing and other sustainability topics in a more public format. The Council does not get enough recognition of its work and should look for more ways to publicize its work. The overall goal is to make and show the State as being the most sustainable of the states.

B. Tom Liebel said that he and Jon Laria, Chair of the Sustainable Growth Commission are planning to present at each other's meetings in the coming month as a way to look at the interface between the two.

C. Anja Caldwell said that she would like to see more case studies, presentations and perhaps tours of green buildings as we have done in the past. Tom asked the Council to think of recommendations for guests and alternate locations. Stephen Gilliss noted that alternate locations would be good during Session if possible.

D. Scott Walchak said that public private development partnerships (P-3s) are moving forward. He wondered since these will not be fully State owned what role the Council might have in terms of them being high performance projects. Tom said that the future is exciting for the P-3s and that the Council has a mandate to promote green building in the state so it can offer support and

commentary. Stephen Gilliss asked why the regulations for these projects can't simply require that they comply with the High Performance Building Act. Scott said the regulations are not worked out yet and wondered if the Council would be involved. Tom said that we don't want to step into anything that's out of our purview except in an advisory capacity. David Costello said that the P-3 approach is to get more infrastructure built with private capital. The private sector will make money with or without sustainability. The Council could act as a resource to promote sustainability. Scott said that his job is to make sure the conversation happens. Mark Beck said that in his experience the developers have already embraced green and that the State will find a friendly audience.

IV. The Council moved on to the continuing task of reviewing the IgCC. Tom Liebel stated that he would like to try to have a draft of the Council's version or modifications of the IgCC to review next month to vote on in October if possible. Today's task is to review Appendix A for additional credits which can be a combination of mandatory or chosen by the design team. We can try to determine how many electives could be required in each section.

A. Started with Section A104 Site electives. This section recommends from 0 to 6 electives be required.

1. A104.1 the flood Hazard Elective makes sense and are easily achieved. Stephen Gilliss noted that if Chapter 4 prohibits flood plane building (which would make sense) this would not be an available elective.
2. A104.2 Wildlife corridor credit would make sense in areas such as western Maryland and the Eastern Shore.
3. A 104.4 Brownfield site project elective also would be an elective. Stephen Gilliss noted that DGS is already stuck with one brownfield site that no agency wants to use once they are aware it is a brownfield and contains methane. Do we really want to promote brownfield building with State money. Tom noted that it's still possible that this will occur so it is a viable elective.
4. A 104.5 site restoration could also be a viable elective on larger parcels especially in Western Maryland and the Eastern Shore.
5. A104.6 mixed use development project elective appears to be viable. Stephen Gilliss noted that few State projects are mixed use.
6. A104.7 changing and shower facilities would be viable though there is a narrow window for this as it only applies to buildings 10,000 gsf or less unless we change it.
7. A104.8 long term bicycle storage could be viable. Caroline Varney Alvarado is concerned that this credit could be achieved on a project that is not in a practical bike friendly location. Would be "gaming the system."
8. A 104.9 heat island electives should be viable. Three of the four apply to Maryland which is located mostly in IECC climate zone 4 (except Garrett County in climate zone 5).
9. Tom asked how many should we require.
  - a. Lauren buckler asked how it coordinates with LEED Silver? Should we look at LEED to see if they can be equivalent. Tom said this would be difficult to do.
  - b. Stephen Gilliss noted it could be difficult to achieve very many of these as they are either geographically dependent or not applicable to State projects.
  - c. Tom said we could add or delete electives.
  - d. Caroline thinks it would be best to require a certain number. Tom thinks we can do 8.
  - e. Meg Andrews said that if it is already required such as the flood hazard, it shouldn't be an elective.
  - f. Caroline asked if any of the electives are a duplication of existing law.
  - g. Tom said the broader notion is whether we require a certain number of credits. This would allow us to tailor an additional level of rigor for the location. Should

we require eight electives? Everyone should take this back to their agencies and look at it...

h. Caroline said that since this is for state buildings her agency may not care but as a model for others it might be important.

i. Tom said we should try to push it. The goal is to drive high performance. In Western Maryland a wildlife corridor is appropriate whereas an infill project is not. He thinks we should call for 8 electives.

**B. Section A105 – Material resource conservation and Efficiency**

1. A105.1 waste management. We are already requiring 80% so a 20% increase would be close to 100%. This may be possible on some projects.

2. A105.3 Material selection – this allows credits for 70% and 85% materials based on mass, volume or cost to be used, recycled content recyclable, bio based or indigenous. These are very impressive goals. Caroline asked if both can be achieved or are they stand alone. As written both can be achieved. Meg asked if any of these electives might be weighted since some will be harder to achieve than others. No, they are all the same.

3. A105.4 gives credits for a building service life plan. This could possibly be mandatory.

a. Lauren Buckler was concerned how this might be funded.

b. Tom said that while the plan might be provided it may not be implemented however by having the plan it might cause the designers to use longer life better products.

c. Anja thought it could be part of the commissioning plan.

d. Tom further stated that long service life products always win out in life cycle cost analysis.

e. Soren Graae was concerned that some of these things could be value engineered out of the project when cost issues occur. Tom thinks it would still make the AE more aware of making better decisions on the front end.

f. David St. Jean said it would be better if this could be planned for in the operating budget for the building. Stephen Gilliss noted that this brings up the capital budget vs. operating budget debate.

g. Tom noted that LEED V4 has some of this in it.

4. 105.5 calls for design of the building's deconstruction.

a. Anja asked as an architect how would one do this? Tom agreed that it might not make sense using the example of the Inner Harbor's Festival Hall which was intended to be deconstructed and ended up being demolished for scrap.

5. 105.6 Existing building reuse credit would be possible in certain circumstances.

6. 105.7 Historic reuse could also be used

7. Tom thought maybe 2 electives could be required in this section

**C. Section A106 is for energy conservation**

1. 106.1 would have to be re-written since we don't use the zEPI score. Would have to have electives for multiple increases over the 15% savings already required.

2. 106.2.2 Mechanical systems elective is do-able.

3. 106.3 Duct insulation is do-able.

4. A lot of the remaining electives are possible. Could achieve 4 or 5 electives in this section.

**D. Section A107 is for water resource conservation**

1. Many of these can be difficult because they require harvesting and storing non-potable water for fixture flushing, fire suppression, cooling tower make up water and others. We're assuming water storage will be expensive. Tom wonders if we could come up with some other water conservation electives such as simply reducing % of potable water use.

2. David Costello wondered how much savings you get with something simple like waterless urinals. Tom said they've achieved 38-42%. Anja agreed that simple water use reduction is do-able.
  3. David Costello wondered how the cost of water storage for reuse compares to the meeting current stormwater regs. Stephen Gilliss wondered the same given all of the cost for the many bio-retention areas needed under the current regs. It's worth looking at. Meg pointed out there is a recharge component involved in storm water and bio-retention . Also that storage might require more maintenance.
  4. Tom said this would require flexibility and collaborative design.
- E. Section A108 is for indoor air quality
1. Tom said he's not sure why all of these can't be required electives.
  2. Anja doesn't like A108.5 as it appears to actually reduce the amount of VOCs in a project. She recommends we strike this one.
  3. Anja does like 108.6 – views to the building exterior. In Germany this is actually an OSHA requirement.
  4. Tom asked if we could add in other items such as acoustics. We need to take a further look at this section since most of the other electives are already covered under our version of Chapter 8.
  5. Possibly give a credit for additional outside air or air control.
  6. Anja says since Chapter 8 is so ambitious there won't be many of these electives available. Maybe the additional IEQ testing.
- F. Tom would like to get the IgCC done. Stephen Gilliss and Ellen Robertson reported that the law change which would enable the use of the code is written and submitted to the Governor's for consideration.
- G. Tom said that next we should be looking at LEED V4 and advise the Secretaries on the additional rigors. Later in the year after the official rollout we can set up a presentation to the Council on the changes.

IV. Tom opened up the floor for "Once Around the Table".

- A. Tom said the sustainable communities tax credit is up for renewal this legislative session. Hopefully it will be renewed and maybe even the cap could be removed.
- B. Scott Walchak noted that the State and DGS are updating websites. If members want to make suggestions or provide content for a green building website. Stephen Gilliss said that we're already talking about it but we're also currently doing a Google migration so it may be a few months before it can happen.
- C. Caroline reminded everyone that the Housing conference is this Friday.
- D. David St. Jean said that the 3rd training for operation and efficiency in State buildings was held last week. 80 facility managers were trained. Hoping to get State agencies to have energy managers.
- E Lauren Buckler said that DGS is working on communicating a unified front on green building, energy and procurement so that the agencies understand what DGS does and what services are available.

VI. The meeting was adjourned at 12:00PM. The next meeting location is scheduled for October 23, 2013 at 10 AM in Room 150 of the Lowe House Office Building

The preceding is intended as a summary only of the discussions held on this meeting date. Council members are requested to review the summary and notify the writer of any errors, omissions or unintended misrepresentations of the discussion.